

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	D. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/721,101 11/21/2000		1/21/2000	Rex Hill	39982/JEJ/X2	3032
35114	7590	03/25/2005	EXAMINER		
		ETWORKING, IN	MEHRA, INDER P		
		TUAL PROPERT CWAY, MS LEGL2	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
PLANO, TX		,	2666		

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		<u> </u>					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summan	09/721,101	HILL ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
The MAN INC DATE of this account of	Inder P Mehra	2666					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with	n the correspondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period volume to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a rep y within the statutory minimum of thirty will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT o, cause the application to become ABA	oly be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for alloware	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 December 2004</u> .  This action is <b>FINAL</b> .  2b) This action is non-final.  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>1-17,19-26 and 28-35</u> is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) <u>1-17,19-26 and 28-35</u> is/are rejected.						
Application Papers							
<ul> <li>9) The specification is objected to by the Examine</li> <li>10) The drawing(s) filed on 21 November 2000 is/a</li> <li>Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct</li> <li>11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine</li> </ul>	re: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ drawing(s) be held in abeyand ion is required if the drawing(s	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). ) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Ap rity documents have been r u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	plication No eceived in this National Stage					
Attachment(s)  1) \( \sum \) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  4) \( \sum \) Interview Summary (PTO-413)							
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)	Mail Date  brmal Patent Application (PTO-152)					

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This is in response to application dated: 12/7/04. Out of 1-36 pending claims, claims 18, 27 and 36 are cancelled (see instant amendment dated 12/7/04), and claims 1-17, 19-26 and 28-35 are pending.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.
- 3. Claims 1, 3-5, 8-11, 14-21, 23-28, and 31-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Maher,III et al (US Patent No. 6,654,373), hereinafter, Maher.

For claims 1, 8, 14, 18, 23 and 36, Maher discloses "a quality of service" shaping and provisioning method for a switch having plurality of ports, refer to abstract, and col. 3 lines 15-20, col. 6 lines 5-12 (102 in fig. 2), col. 7 lines 35-40, 128 of fig. 2, and col. 8 lines 14-16; method for switch having plurality of ports, refer to col. 1 lines 50-51, col. 3 lines 35-37, col. 6 lines 5-7, the method comprising the steps of :

receiving a packet having a first priority value (fast pathon a first port of the switch
 ("VOIP as well as real time services such as video over the internet makes QOS a
 priority", refer to col. 5 lines 18-21, "QOS processor to assign the necessary bandwidth - --with high QOS and reliability requirements", refer to col. 7 lines 48-50, "Data packets

Art Unit: 2666

are then sent along fast data path126 to output PHY interface 120 (port), refer to col. 8 lines 26-27);

Page 3

- determining a second priority value and a third priority value for the packet based on one or more flow properties, as recited by claims 1, 5, 8, 11, 21, 14, 18, 19-21, 23, 27-28,
   33, 35 and 36, (refer to "process any information –the headers associated with a particular layer of the network ---protocols. Inferences can be made about the type of traffic (priority),----, such as address or port numbers, as specified at page 5 lines 28-32, col. 7 lines 57-65, col. 8 lines 29-32, and col. 12 lines 27-30;
- processing the packet on the switch based on the second priority value, refer to col. 7
   lines 64-66; and col. 12 lines 27-30;
- transmitting the packet on a second port of the switch with the third priority value, refer to col. 7 lines 64-66;
- third priority value is applied in processing the packet on a device to which the switch transmits the packet, as recited by claim 8, (refer to "the quality of service processor on the egress route engine card ---allocates access to the physical egress ports based on packet priority", refer to col. 3 lines 35-38;
- applying the third priority value to the packet prior to transmission from the switch, aas
   recited by claim 14, (refer to "the quality of service processor on the egress route engine card ---allocates access to the physical egress ports based on packet priority", refer to col. 3 lines 35-38.
- an access controller ("traffic flow scanning processor 140 including header processor 104 coupled to input ports 102", refer to col. 6 lines 15-25), coupled to the input ports

Art Unit: 2666

102 for receiving the inbound packet---- having an inbound priority value and a plurality of flow properties (type or protocol, of the data packet---attributes of data packet, such as source address/port and destination address/port, refer to col. 6 lines 26-30, as recited by claim 23.

Page 4

- wherein the determining step includes a selected one of the following sub steps, refer to col. 7 lines 44-col. 8 line 6:
  - passing the first priority value;
  - forcing the first priority value to a lower priority value; and inverting the first priority value.

For claims 3, 9, 15, 26 and 31, Maher discloses all the limitations of subject matter including: "wherein the first priority value includes an inbound priority value, ("data packets are sent through fast path", first priority, refer to col. 8 lines 25-28); and further discloses, "the second priority value which is determined based on the inbound priority value", (internal quality based on the conclusion, refer to col. 7 lines 40-50.

For claims 4, 16, 24 and 34, Mahr discloses all the limitations of subject matter including the limitation "wherein the second priority value includes an internal priority value, and the internal priority value is used to indicate a processing priority of the packet while the packet is being processed in the switch", refer to col. 8 lines 40-56.

For claims 5, 11, 19-21, 27-28 and 33, Maher discloses all the limitations of subject

Application/Control Number: 09/721,101 Page 5

Art Unit: 2666

matter including:

• "wherein the second and third priority value is determined based on one or more flow properties including at least one value from a packet field that is not dedicated to defining QOS" (as specified, flow properties include the values from packet fields ----may include but are not limited to source and destination addresses, such as layer 2, layer 3 and layer 4 port numbers---socket Ids, refer to page 5 lines 28-32), refer to Maher's col. 1 lines 30-35, col. 5 lines 25-32.

For claims 10, 17, 25 and 32, Maher discloses all the limitations of the subject matter including the limitation "wherein the third priority value includes an outbound priority value and the outbound priority value is applied to the packet before the packet is transferred from the switch (The quality of service processor then sends the data packets to the switch fabric which routes the data packets to the route engine card associated with its physical egress port———allocates access to the physical egress ports based on packet priority.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2666

Page 6

5. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Maher** as applied to claims 1, 8, 14, 18, 23 and 36 above, and further in view of **Voit et al** (US Patent No. 6,424,657), hereinafter, Voit.

For claim 2, Maher discloses all the limitations of the subject matter with the exception of the following limitation:"802.IQ tag field", which is disclosed by Voit, refer to cols. 25-26 (table 2)

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the field of "802.IQ". This capability is achieved by combining the "802.IQ" field as taught by Voit. The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to support a number of different levels of quality of service requirements, and also to shape the downstream traffic.

6. Claims 6, 12 and 29, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maher, as applied to claims 1, 8, 14, 18, 23 and 36 above, and further in view **Kloth et al** (US Patent No. 6,643,260), hereinafter, Kloth.

For claims 6, 12 and 29, Maher discloses all the limitations of the subject matter with the exception of the following limitation "wherein the first priority value is mapped by a QOS shaping map into the second priority value", which is disclosed by Kloth, refer to col. 11 lines 10-16

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the capability of priority value mapping. This capability is achieved by combining the capability as taught by Kloth. The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to

Art Unit: 2666

implement a <u>quality of service (QoS)</u> policy in a data communications network so as to thereby <u>prioritize</u> network traffic into a plurality of service levels and provide preferential treatment of different classes of data traffic on the data communications network. A number of <u>priority</u> levels may be implemented in accordance with the invention.

Page 7

7. Claims 7, 13, 22 and 30, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Maher**, as applied to claims 1, 8, 14, 18, 23 and 36 above, in view **Kloth et al** (US Patent No. 6,643,260), hereinafter, Kloth, and further in view **Wang et al** (US Patent No. 6,606,311), hereinafter, Wang.

For claims 7, 13, 22 and 30, Maher discloses all the limitations of the subject matter with the exception of the following limitation "wherein mapping information of the QOS shaping map can be updated during operation of the switch", refer to col. 7 lines 25-38.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the capability of priority value mapping and updating. This capability is achieved by combining the capability as taught by Wang. The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to implement a quality of service (QoS) policy in a data communications network so as to thereby prioritize network traffic into a plurality of service levels and provide preferential treatment of different classes of data traffic on the data communications network. A number of priority levels may be implemented in accordance with the invention.

Application/Control Number: 09/721,101 Page 8

Art Unit: 2666

## Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 12/7/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues "While Maher may indicate flow priorities not dedicated to defining QOS, it does not disclose, teach or render obvious using these in QOS shaping, as is presently claimed.

In response, it is stated that "quality of service shaping" is not claimed limitation in the claim.

In light of explanation, as above, the argument by applicant is not persuasive.

9. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2666

13 : 1

#### Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Inder P Mehra whose telephone number is 571-272-3170. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8AM to 5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Seema Rao can be reached on 571-272-3174. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Index Pal Mehra
Inder P Mehra
Examiner 3/17/05

Art Unit 2666